

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims pending in the application are requested.

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application, as follows:

1. Claims 11, 19, 32 and 38 have been objected to for minor informalities.
2. Claims 1-10, 32 and 37-39 have been rejected under 35 USC 112/2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claims 1, 2, 19-23, 28-33 and 35-37 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as anticipated by Ramamurthy, of record.
4. Claims 3 and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ramamurthy, of record.
5. Claims 5, 6, 11-17 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramamurthy, of record in view of USP 6,705,522 B2 to A. Gershman et al, issued March 16, 2004, filed October 3, 2001 (hereafter "Gershman").
6. Claims 4, 25-27 and 34 have been rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as unpatentable over Ramamurthy in view of Ramberg.
7. Claims 7-10, 18 and 38 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramamurthy, of record in view of Gershman et al, of record, as applied to USP 6,857,013 to J. Ramberg et al. issued February 2005, filed January 29, 1999 (Ramberg) and USP 6,608,841 to R. Koodli, issued August 2003, filed December 30, 1999 (Koodli).

Claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 19, 21, 23, 29 -33, 35, 37-39 have been amended to overcome the objections/rejections under 35 USC 112/2, 102 (e) and 103 (a), as appropriate and/or further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited art. Claims 40 and 41 have been added to obtain further protection for the disclosed subject matter.

Before responding to the rejection, applicants would like to technically distinguish Ramamurthy, Ramberg and Gershman from the claimed subject matter (Jalkanen), as follows:

A. Ramamurthy discloses an automatic data collection system for networking applications (Fig. 1) including an RFID reader 42 capable of automatically (without intermediary software or human operator) to read contents of RFID tags (including designated fields that identify a destination computer system and/or application program) and distribute the collected

information from the tags to a destination determined by the read RFID tags. From figure 1 it can be clearly seen that the RFID reader 42 and the server 22 are separate entities and from figure 2 it can be seen that the processor of the RFID reader is equipped for receiving RFID tag contents and communicate the received information to the external server 22. There's no indication that the processor of the RFID reader would utilize the read RFID tag contents to be used in a local application.

In contrast, Jalkanen at page 17, lines 14-17 discloses the reader using the tag contents for a local reader application or a network address based on address information contained in the tag. Accordingly, Ramamurthy reference does not include any kind of hint or suggestion relating to the aspect of determining, by the reader device, based on an indication read from the RFID tag, whether the contents of the read tag is destined to the device reading the tag itself, or to an address external from the device reading the tag.

B. Ramberg discloses an ADC routing mechanism which analyzes the data type of incoming ADC data, references an ADC data grid containing ADC client data requests, and the routes the received data to the appropriate client(s). The ADC data routing mechanism may comprise an ADC data server, ADC device handlers, ADC protocol handlers, and an ADC data grid. The ADC device handlers and ADC protocol handlers translate received ADC data into a non-device specific form suitable for processing by the ADC data server. The ADC data server analyzes the received ADC data to determine its data type. The ADC data server then references the ADC data grid to determine which clients have registered data requests matching the received ADC data. The ADC data server next transmits the ADC data to the identified client(s). Data may be communicated to remote users using any data protocol, including the Transmission Control Protocol ("TCP"), the User Datagram/Internet Protocol ("UDP/IP") or the User Datagram Plus Protocol ("UDP+"). Ramberg fails to describe an RFID system in a mobile environment using packetized and preferably standardized and globally addressable data formats for local processing of received data in the mobile device or re-transmission of the received data to an external device via a network.

C. Gershman discloses identifying locations of objects. A first location of a mobile transceiver unit is determined and a first plurality of objects each having a tag attached to the object are illuminated with electromagnetic radiation. The mobile transceiver unit then

simultaneously senses electromagnetic radiation emitted by the tags attached to the first plurality of objects. The identities of the first plurality of objects are determined from the sensed electromagnetic radiation. Gershman fails to disclose a mobile transceiver that may process received RF data locally or re-transmit the data for processing at an external network address.

Applicants note that Koodli is disqualified as a reference under 35 USC 103(c), as provided by MPEP 706.02(l) (1). **The subject application and USP 6,608,841 (Koodli) were, at the time the invention of the subject application was made, commonly owned by Nokia Corporation, the assignee of the subject application.** Further comment on Koodli as a reference is not warranted.

Now turning to the rejection, applicants respond to the indicated paragraphs of the rejection, as follows:

Regarding Paragraphs 1 and 2:

Applicants have amended claims 11, 19, 32 and 38 to overcome the Examiner's objections. Entry of the amendments and withdrawal of the objections are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 3:

Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 32, 37, 38 and 39 to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112/2. Entry of the amendments to the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112/2 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 4:

Claim 1, 2, 19-23, 28-33 and 35-37 include features not disclosed in Ramamurthy and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102(e), as follows:

A. Claim 1:

(i) "identifying code in the format identifying the data format and an indication whether the data should be processed locally at a reader device communicating with said transponder or sent to an external destination for processing."

Ramamurthy at col. 7, lines 40-55 discloses a reader receives tag data which identifies the protocol used by the tag and the associated software that supports the protocol. The reader generates a data packet containing the tag data, and forwards the packet to an external

server for handling. In the event the tag data is not complete or unknown, the reader forwards the data to a generic process executing in the external server. Alternatively, the reader may discard the data. Ramamurthy at col.7, lines 29-39. In contrast, Jalkanen at page 7, lines 2-8 discloses the tag data may be processed locally by an application in the reader or transmitted to an external network address for processing according to an indication in the tag packet.

Ramamurthy fails to disclose a transponder storing packetized data including address information for local processing by an application in the reader or re-transmitting the packetized data to a network address for external processing of the data.

Claim 1, as now presented, describes subject matter not disclosed in Ramamurthy. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102 (e) based on Ramamurthy and allowance of claim 1 are requested.

B. Claim 2:

(i) “signal means responsive to an activation signal for transmitting or receiving and storing packetized data.”

Jalkanen at page 13, lines 4-8, discloses the transponder receives and stores packetized data transmitted by the reader and transmits stored packetized data to the reader. Applicants can find no disclosure in Ramamurthy relating to the reader writing and storing packetized data in the transponder, as described in Jalkanen at page 18, lines 8-11. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 2 are requested. In any case, Claim 2 further limits claim 1 and is patentable on the same basis thereof.

C. Claims 19 and 36:

(i) “identifying a format of the data packet via a code in the data packet including an indication whether the data packet should be processed locally at a reader device communication with a transponder or sent to an external destination for processing;”

Ramamurthy fails to disclose a transponder storing data by a network address and/or a local address in a receiver for reasons indicated in connection with the consideration of claim 1, above.

(ii) “routing the processed data packet directly to a destination address defined in the standardized and globally addressable format or to a local address of an application running in the receiver, according to the indication in the data packet.”

Ramamurthy at col. 7, lines 40-55 discloses all read information is forwarded by the reader to a server for forwarding to a destination computer. In contrast, Jalkanen at page 7, lines 2-8 discloses the tag data may be processed locally by an application in the reader or transmitted to an external network address for processing according to the address information in the tag packet.

Ramamurthy fails to disclose the above features (i) and (ii). Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102 (e) based on Ramamurthy and allowance of claims 19 and 36 are requested.

D. Claims 20 and 28:

Claims 20 and 28 further limit claim 19 and are patentable over Ramamurthy on the same basis as claim 19.

E. Claims 21/22:

Claims 21 and 22 further limit claim 19 and are patentable over Ramamurthy on the same basis as claim 19.

F. Claim 23:

(i) “The method according to claim 19, wherein the destination address is a multicast address of a personal area network.”

Applicants submit that claim 23, as now amended, is supported by Jalkanen at page 10, lines 12-14 and describes patentable subject matter not disclosed in Ramamurthy.

G. Claim 29:

(i) “The method according to claim 20 wherein the header data includes a looped-back address if the destination is a local device.”

Applicants submit that claim 29, as now amended, is supported by Jalkanen at page 17, lines 15-18 and describes patentable subject matter not disclosed in Ramamurthy.

H. Claim 30:

(i) “The method according to claim 19 wherein the routed packets via an IP stack can be directed to a network or an application within the device receptive to the standardized and globally addressable format.”

Applicants submit that claim 30, as now amended, is supported by Jalkanen at page 7, lines 2-8 describes patentable subject matter not disclosed in Ramamurthy.

I. Claim 31:

Claim 31 has been amended to depend from claim 30 and is patentable over Ramamurthy on the same basis as claim 30

J. Claim 32:

(i) “determining if a tag is writeable, and, if so, alerting an application program executable in a mobile device or a network to prepare to transmit data after a reader completes a handshake with the tag;”

Ramamurthy at col. 5, lines 1-10 describes the processor writes data recovered from the tag. The cited text does not describe writing text into the tag, as described in Jalkanen at page 18, lines 8 -20. Ramamurthy at col. 6, line 54 continuing to col, 7, line 10 describes the reader contacting the tag. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited text relating to the reader writing into the tag.

(ii) “transmitting the data to the reader from the application program for retransmission of the data to the tag;”

Ramamurthy at col. 4, line 56 continuing to col. 6, line 10 describes (1) the reader processing recovered data from the tag, and (2) the tag processing commands from the reader. Applicant can find no disclosure in the cited text of the reader re-transmitting application data stored in the reader to the tag.

(iii) “receiving and storing the transmitted data in the tag which may include over-writing the data in an erasable read-only memory included in the tag;” and

Ramamurthy at col. 5 line 22 continuing to col. 6, line 14 describes (1) the reader processing captured signals from the tag, and (2) the storing the reader commands in a memory. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited text wherein the tag memory overwrites data in the memory.

Summarizing, Ramamurthy at the cited texts, at best, discloses the reader writing commands into the tag memory. There is no disclosure in Ramamurthy of the reader writing application data into the tag memory.

The rejection of claim 32 under 35 USC 102 (e) based on Ramamurthy is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal and allowance of claim 32 are requested.

K. Claim 33:

(i) “at least one data carrier having at least one data packet embedded therein in a standardized and globally addressable format, the data packet including an indication whether the data packet should be processed locally at a device or sent to an external destination address;”

Ramamurthy fails to disclose an indication in the data packet for processing the data packet for the reasons indicated in connection with the consideration of claim 1.

(ii) “an application at a local address in the data receiving device receptive to the standardized and globally addressable format for receiving and processing the routed received data packet, according to the indication in the data packet.”

Ramamurthy at col. 3, lines 55-61 describes a processor 46 in a reader for processing data signals received from RFID tags. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited text of an application in the reader receiving and processing the routed text, as described in Jalkanen at page 16, lines 17-18.

Ramamurthy provides no support for the rejection of claim 33 under 35 USC 102 (e). Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 33 are requested.

L. Claim 35:

Claim 35 depends from claim 33 and is patentable over Ramamurthy on the same basis as claim 33.

M. Claim 37:

(i) “identifying code in the format identifying the data format, the packetized data including an indication whether received packetized data should be processed locally at a device or sent to an external destination address;”

Ramamurthy fails to disclose the above feature (i) for the same reasons previously indicated in the consideration of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 under 35 USC 102 (e) based on Ramamurthy and allowance of claim 37 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 5:

Claims 3 and 24 include features not disclosed or suggested in Ramamurthy in view of Ramberg, and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a), as follows:

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 1.

Claim 24 depends from claim 19 via claim 20 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 19.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 24 under 35 USC 103 (a) based on Ramamurthy in view of Ramberg and allowance thereof are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 6:

Claims 5, 6, 11-17 and 39 describe features not disclosed or suggested by Ramamurthy in view of Gershman, and overcome the rejection of the rejected claims, as follows:

A. Claims 5 and 11:

(i) “signal apparatus transmitting activation signals to at least one RFID transponder and receiving packetized datagrams in standardized and globally addressable data



formats transportable in a distributed information system comprising the Internet from the at least one transponder, the packetized datagrams including an indication whether received packetized datagrams should be processed locally at the device or sent to an external destination address.”

Ramamurthy, at col. 5, lines 10-39, and line 65 - col. 6, line 14, describes an RFID reader sending and receiving signals to a transponder. The transponder contains a data storage having plural fields, one of which has a predefined IP address field and a Port number field. In contrast, Jalkanen stores the data within a transponder having a standardized and globally addressable format, e.g., UDP, IDP, etc. Moreover, the data includes an indication whether received packetized datagrams should be processed locally at the device or sent to an external destination address. Ramamurthy fails to disclose /receiving packetized datagrams in a standardized and globally addressable data formats, and whether received data should be processed locally by the device or sent to an external destination.

(ii) “reading apparatus processing the packetized datagrams from a transponder for delivery to at least one of a local application at the device and an external destination address in a standardized and globally addressable data format”

Ramamurthy, at col. 5, lines 40-64, fails to disclose delivering packetized datagrams to a local application at the device or an external address in a standardized and globally addressable data format.

Ramamurthy fails to disclose the limitations of claim 5.

Gershman does not supply the missing limitation in Ramamurthy. Gershman only describes a mobile transceiver that transmits and receives two/from and off RFID tags. Applicant can find no disclosure in Gershman relating to data packets using standardized and globally addressable data format or delivering packetized datagrams to a local application at the device or to an external address.

The rejection of claim 5 and 11 is without support in the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) and allowance of claim 5 and 11 are requested.

B. Claim 39:

(i) “a transponder containing packetized datagrams in standardized and globally addressable data formats transportable in a network and responsive to activation signal, the packetized datagrams including an indication whether received packetized data should be processed locally at a device or sent to an external destination address;”

As discussed above in connection with the consideration of claims 5 and 11, Ramamurthy and Gershman fail to disclose packetized data including an indication for processing received data at a local device or at an external address.

(i) “a reader in the terminal processing the packetized datagrams transmitted from the transponder for delivery to a network or a local application in the reader in a standardized and globally addressable data format without alteration of the packetized datagrams wherein the communication protocol stack parses a header in the packetized datagram and routes the packetized datagram to a destination, according to the indication in the packetized datagrams if a checksum in the packetized datagram is valid.”

Ramamurthy at col. 6, lines 15 -40 discloses the reader includes a routing process for routing the data packets into and out of an external server. Ramamurthy fails to disclose the reader routing packets to a local application in the reader, according to an indication in datagram, as described in Jalkanen at page 17, lines 14 -17.

The rejection of claim 39 under 35 USC 103 (a) based on Ramamurthy in view of Gershman is without support in the cited art. Allowance of claim 39 is requested.

C. Claim 6:

Ramamurthy at col. 6, lines 15-41 discloses a routing application for routing packets into and out of an external server. The routing process is not responsive to packet data as described in Jalkanen at page 12, lines 4-8.

The rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC 103 (a) based on Ramamurthy is without support in the cited art. Allowance of claim 6 is requested.

D. Claim 12:

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is patentable on the same basis thereof.

E. Claim 13:

Ramamurthy, at col. 7, lines 12-39, discloses a reader forwards tag data to a generic processor when the IP address and port number cannot be detected. Ramamurthy does not disclose a check sum for checking the data content, as described in the specification at page 6, lines 10-14.

Claim 14 further limits claim 13 and is patentable on the same basis thereof.

F. Claim 15:

Ramamurthy requests re-transmission, but does not notify an application running in the mobile device of an un-successful retransmission. In any case, claim 15 depends upon claim 13 and is patentable for the same reasons thereof.

G. Claim 16:

Ramamurthy at col. 7, lines 45-55 discloses a processor generates a data packet containing the RFID data. In contrast, Jalkanen discloses at page 17, steps 3-7 the RFID data packet is sent directly to an application running in the device or in a network. In any case claim 16 depends upon claim 13 and is patentable on the same basis.

H. Claim 17:

Ramamurthy at col. 7, lines 18 -39 discloses the processor validates address and port number fields of the datagram. Ramamurthy does not validate the packet header via a checksum as described in Jalkanen at page 16, steps step 4. In any case, claim 17 is patentable on the same basis as claim 13 from which it depends

Regarding Paragraph 7:

Claims 4, 25-27 and 34 include features not disclosed in Ramamurthy in view of Ramberg and Koodli, and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a), as follows:

A. Claims 4, 25-27 and 34 depend upon base claims which include limitations, e.g. (a) identifying code in the data packet format identifying the data format, a network address for external processing of the data, and a local address within a reader for local processing of the data, and (b) directly transferring data packets to an application in a reader, none of which are disclosed or suggested in Ramamurthy. Without each and every claim limitation being shown in the reference, as in the present instance, the rejection is improper per MPEP 2143.03.

B. Koodli is disqualified as a reference under 35 USC 103 (c). Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to provide a reference to support modification of Ramamurthy to perform compressing and decompressing of the data, contrary to the requirements of MPEP 2133.1, at pages 2100-131.

The rejection of claims 4, 25-27 and 34 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a) based on the cited references and allowance of claims 4, 25-27 and 34 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 8:

Claims 7-10, 18 and 38 include features not disclosed or suggested in Ramamurthy in view of Gershman and in further view of Ramberg and Koodli, and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103 (a), as follows:

A. Claims 7, 8, 10, 18 and 38:

The above rejected claims depend directly or indirectly from claim 5, and are patentable on the same basis thereof. Ramamurthy, Ramberg and Gershman all fail to disclose or suggest datagrams containing address information for external processing of the datagrams in a network or in a reader receiving the datagrams. Moreover, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest compressing/decompressing header information. Koodli cited by the Examiner for disclosing the compression/decompression feature is disqualified as a reference under 35 USC 103 (c).

The rejection of claims 7, 8, 10, 18 and 38 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 10, 18 and 38 under 35 USC 103 (a) and allowance thereof are requested.

B. Claim 9:

Claim 9 depends from claim 5, via claims 6 and 8, and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 5.

Patentability Support for New Claims:

Claim 40 follows claim 5 and describes a mobile device receiving packetized datagrams from a transponder and directing the packetized datagram to the mobile device for processing or to a network for processing according to the address information contained in the packetized datagrams. The cited art discloses a reader addressing packetized data from a transponder to a server for routing to addresses in a network determined by the reader. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest a sole mobile device routing packetized datagrams from a transponder to the mobile device for processing or to a network address for processing according to the address information contained in the packetized data grams.

Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and describes handling failed delivery of packetized datagrams at the mobile device. In contrast, Ramamurthy at col. 7, line 30-35 describes the reader forwarding failed delivery of packetized datagrams to an external generic processor for handling. Claim 41 handles failed datagram delivery at the mobile device. The cited art handles failed datagram delivery at an external device.

Claims 40 and 41 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Entry and allowance of claims 40 and 41 are requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

Having (a) amended claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, 29-33 35-38 and 39 to overcome the objections and rejections under 35 USC 112/2, 102 (e) and 103 (a), as appropriate, and (b) supported the patentability of new claims 40 and 41, applicants request entry of the amendment, allowance of the claims and passage to issue of the case.

**AUTHORIZATION:**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4134. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4134. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 2, 2005

By: Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.  
Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Registration No. 18,753

(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101